

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/016,739	01/30/1998	D. MICHAEL GODWIN	1002-0537	7368
7	590 06/12/2002			
BRADFORD G. ADDISON			EXAMINER	
MAGINOT,ADDISON & MOORE BANK ONE CENTER TOWER			UNDERWOOD, DONALD W	
	ENT CIRCLE SUITE 3000 IS, IN 462045130		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
non non	15, 11 1020 15150		3652	
			DATE MAILED: 06/12/2002	!

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Office	Action	Summary
--------	--------	---------

Application No. 09/016739	Applicant(s)	Godwin et al	
Examiner		Group Art Unit	
Underwood		3652	

-	CAMILLIO	
	Underwood	3652
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet bene	eath the correspondence address—
Period for Reply	_	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TOF THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIRE Three	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a refined period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state</li> </ul>	eply within the statutory minimum , expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the	of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. e mailing date of this communication .
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	3/02	•
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193</li> </ul>	t for formal matters, <b>prosecu</b> 35 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.	ition as to the merits is closed in
Disposition of Claims		
Claim(s) $1-3$ , $5-18$ , $20-25$ Of the above claim(s) None		is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration.
Claim(s) 1-3, 5-18, 20		is/are allowed.
∑ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12, 20  ∑ Claim(s) 21-25		is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)		
□ Claim(s)—————		are subject to restriction or election
Application Papers		requirement.
□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir	ng Review PTO-948	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		disapproved.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object		,
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.  Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u  All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of received.	the priority documents have	been
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u  All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of	the priority documents have	been
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u  All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of received.  received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numb	the priority documents have er)emational Bureau (PCT Rule	e 1 7.2(a)).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u  All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of received.  received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numb	the priority documents have er)emational Bureau (PCT Rule	e 1 7.2(a)).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u  All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of received.  received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numb received in this national stage application from the Int	the priority documents have er)er)emational Bureau (PCT Rule	e 1 7.2(a)).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of received.  received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numb received in this national stage application from the Int *Certified copies not received:  Attachment(s)	the priority documents have er)emational Bureau (PCT Rule No(s)	e been e 1 7.2(a)).

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No. 37

Art Unit: 3652

## **Detailed Action**

- Receipt of applicant's request for continued examination filed
   March 13, 2002 is acknowledged. This request has been granted. An action follows.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton in view of Wiechman or vice versa.

Application/Control Number: 09/016,739

Art Unit: 3652

It would have been obvious to substitute a boom and linkage as clalimed for the

boom and cylinder in Burton in view of the teaching in Wiechman or to provide a pin

safety structure as claimed in Wiechman in view of the teaching in Burton.

5. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kovacs in view of Burton and Wiechman.

It would have been obvious to provide a coupling including the pin safety

structure as claimed in Kovacs in view of the teaching in Burton and also obvious to use

a box boom construction in view of the teaching of Wiechman (column 3, lines 45-47).

6. Claims 1-3, 5-18 and 20 are allowed.

7. Applicants' argument regarding their box boom has been carefully

considered but is not deemed persuasive in view of Wiechman col. 3, lines 45-47.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Donald

Underwood at telephone number 308-1113.

Underwood/dw

June 10, 2002

whould W. Underwood 06/12/02

Page 3

ONALD W. UNDERWOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER